UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
EDWARD J. FITZPATRICK,	~
Plaintiff,	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER 10-CV-4250 (FB)
-against-	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security,	
Defendant.	
Appearances: For the Plaintiff: CHRISTOPHER JAMES BOWES, ESQ. 54 Cobblestone Drive Shoreham, NY 11786	For the Defendant: LORETTA E. LYNCH, ESQ. United States Attorney CANDACE SCOTT APPLETON, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorney Eastern District of New York 271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, NY 11201
BLOCK, Senior District Judge:	
Plaintiff, Edward Fitzpatrick	("Fitzpatrick"), seeks review of the final decision
of the Commissioner of Social Security ("Co	ommissioner") denying his application for benefits
under the Social Security Act (the "Act").	Both parties move for judgment on the pleadings
pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedu	re 12(c).
Fitzpatrick, a former firefight	er, applied for benefits on January 9, 2004 alleging
that he became disabled on July 28, 2002 w	hen he fell down a flight of stairs and injured his

knees and back. In a decision dated September 14, 2009, following hearings held on July 31,

2008 and February 19, 2009, an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") determined that Fitzpatrick

was not disabled under the Act. In evaluating that ruling, the Court "review[s] the

1 administrative record de novo to determine whether there is substantial evidence supporting

2 the Commissioner's decision and whether the Commissioner applied the correct legal

3 standard." Acierno v. Barnhart, 475 F.3d 77, 80-81 (2d Cir. 2007) (quoting Pollard v. Halter, 377

4 F.3d 183, 188 (2d Cir. 2004)). The ALJ erred in two respects.

First, the ALJ violated the treating physician rule when she failed, without adequate explanation, to give controlling weight to the opinion of Fitzpatrick's treating physician and orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Daniel Wilen ("Dr. Wilen"). AR at 209. Instead, the ALJ credited the opinion of consulting physician Dr. Arthur Brovender, who based his own review on a partial record devoid of Dr. Wilen's notes. AR at 526-27. In so doing, the ALJ failed to consider the detailed medical records that Fitzpatrick provided, and to take into account Dr. Wilen's expertise as a specialist in orthopedics or the duration and frequency of his treatment relationship with Fitzpatrick. *See Clark v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 143 F.3d 115, 118 (2d Cir. 1998) (listing factors the ALJ must consider when treating physician's opinion is not given weight). Even if Dr. Wilen's clinical findings were inadequate, the ALJ "has an affirmative obligation to develop the administrative record" by seeking additional information before relying on a contrary, non-contemporaneous opinion. *Schaal v. Apfel*, 134 F.3d 496, 505 (2d Cir. 2008) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Second, the ALJ improperly found that Fitzpatrick's subjective complaints of pain were not "corroborated by objective medical evidence." AR at 207. This assessment is not supported by substantial evidence. The documented, permanent damage that Fitzpatrick suffered to his spine and knees could reasonably be expected to cause him pain. Additional

1	evidence of record, including Fitzpatrick's testimony, prescriptions lists and Dr. Wilen'		
2	treatment notes, shows that Fitzpatrick's daily activities were limited due to pain, that he ha		
3	had two knee surgeries and that he has taken a variety	of pain medications. See, e.g., Genier	
4	v. Astrue, 606 F.3d 46, 49-50 (2d Cir. 2010) (citing 20 C.F.R. § 404.1539(c)).		
5	For the foregoing reasons, the Commission	oner's motion is denied and the case is	
6	remanded for further proceedings. On remand, the Al	LJ should properly apply the treating	
7	physician rule, and then proceed to assess claimant's credibility in light of the newly		
8	developed record and the evidence as a whole.		
9	SO ORDERED.		
10	<u>-</u>		
11		FREDERIC BLOCK	
12		Senior United States District Judge	
13	Brooklyn, New York		
14 15	September 26, 2011		